



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

TM

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,596	01/10/2002	Tetsuya Araki	500.40786CX1	5377
24956	7590	02/27/2006	EXAMINER	
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.			TARAE, CATHERINE MICHELLE	
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 370				3623
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			DATE MAILED: 02/27/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/041,596	ARAKI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> C. Michelle Tarae	<b>Art Unit</b> 3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2002.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 13-25 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 13-25 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/981,756.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/10/02, 3/2/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_ .  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The following is a Non-Final Office Action in response to the communication received on January 10, 2002. Claims 1-12 have been canceled and claims 13-25 have been added in a preliminary amendment. Claims 13-25 are now pending in this application.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The examiner has reviewed the patents and publications supplied in the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) provided on January 10, 2002 and March 2, 2004.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 13-20 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kanaya et al. (U.S. 6,493,675).

As per claim 13, Kanaya et al. discloses a server computer that conducts item allocation in a workflow system that processes items in computers in accordance with a

previously defined business process, said server computer being connected to a plurality of other computers and a database for storing items, said server computer comprising:

an item extraction condition table corresponding to said business process (col. 13, lines 44-col. 14, line 28; Figures 5-7; Figure 6 is an example of a workflow management table that uses Work ID's and Work Flow ID's as item selection keys to identify the desired work activity. The workflow engine determines the next work activity based on the workflow definition, which uses the various ID's to define the work activity. The workflow tables reside on a server.); and

an item allocation processing section for receiving an item acquisition request containing a business process identifier from a computer included in said other computers (col. 14, lines 49-51; Figure 9; The workflow management engine receives a process request from a user of the system. The process request extracts items from different tables to create a work activity depending on the type of request.), extracting items satisfying a previously determined condition from said item extraction condition table based on said received item acquisition request, selecting one item from among said extracted items by using an item selection key, and transmitting said selected item to said computer included in said other computers that transmitted said item acquisition request (col. 14, lines 49-58; col. 15, lines 7-40; items S10 and S12 in Figure 9 show that items are searched for in the workflow engine management table based on the type of request and using the Work ID as a key. If the key matches, then the item is selected

and added to the work information management table for the process request (i.e., work activity) to be executed.).

As per claim 15, Kanaya et al. discloses a server computer that conducts item allocation in a workflow system according to claim 13, wherein said item selection key is an identifier added to said item acquisition request, time when said request has been received, or an identifier depending upon a worker who has transmitted said item acquisition request (col. 14, lines 49-58; col. 15, lines 7-40; items S10 and S12 in Figure 9 show that items are searched for in the workflow engine management table based on the type of request and using the Work ID as a key. If the key matches, then the item is selected and added to the work information management table for the process request (i.e., work activity) to be executed.).

As per claim 17, Kanaya et al. discloses a server computer that conducts item allocation in a workflow system according to claim 13, wherein said item selection key is a value depending upon a client program that operates in each of said other computers (col. 14, lines 29-43; Figures 5 and 8; Each client computer uses a system communications management program that is configured to communicate workflow data to the workflow engine management table generation program. Therefore, the selection key value must be a value that both the client and server programs understand.).

As per claim 19, Kanaya et al. discloses a server computer that conducts item allocation in a workflow system according to claim 17, wherein said value depending upon a client program that operates in each of said computers is a thread ID of the client program, a process ID of the client program, an object reference acquired from

the client program, or an identifier of a connection formed from the client program to the server at time of said item request (col. 13, lines 53-65; The value is a Work ID, which identifies a work process.).

As per claim 23, Kanaya et al. discloses a server computer that conducts item allocation in a workflow system according to claim 13, wherein said item allocation processing section operates for each of works of a business process stored in the server (Figure 5; The workflow engine is stored on the server. The workflow engine stores and manages business process data.).

As per claim 25, Kanaya et al. discloses a workflow system including a server computer and a plurality of client computers, said server computer being connected to said plurality of client computers and a database for storing items, said server computer extracting a workflow control program, said workflow control program when executed causing server to perform:

receiving item acquisition conditions and item acquisition requests from said client computers (col. 14, lines 49-51; Figure 9; The workflow management engine receives a process request from a user of the system. The process request extracts items from different tables to create a work activity depending on the type of request.);

extracting items from among items stored in said databases, based on said received item acquisition conditions and transmitting said extracted items to said client computers, wherein each of said client computers executing a workflow client program for causing said client computer to perform selecting items to be processed in the client computer from among items received from said server computer by using an item

selection key (col. 14, lines 49-58; col. 15, lines 7-40; items S10 and S12 in Figure 9 show that items are searched for in the workflow engine management table based on the type of request and using the Work ID as a key. If the key matches, then the item is selected and added to the work information management table for the process request (i.e., work activity) to be executed.).

Claims 14, 16, 18, 20 and 24 recite substantially similar subject matter as claims 13, 15, 17, 19, 23 and 25 above. Therefore, claims 14, 16, 18, 20 and 24 are rejected on the same basis as claims 13, 15, 17, 19, 23 and 25 above.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanaya et al. (U.S. 6,493,675) as applied above.

As per claim 21, Kanaya et al. does not expressly disclose a server computer than conducts item allocation in a workflow system according to claim 13, wherein said item selection key is either an IP address or an MAC address of each of said computers. However, Kanaya et al. does disclose the work ID being a unique serial number (col. 13, lines 53-54) as well as the ID of a workflow management engine (col.

13, lines 60-65) being used to identify the workflow engine on the server. It is old and well known that an IP/MAC address is a unique number that identifies a computer on a network. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for the system of Kanaya et al. to use an IP/MAC address as an item selection key since the system of Kanaya et al. already employs unique numbers as selection keys, and furthermore, an IP/MAC address could identify the computer from which a request is being made or the computer that is to process the request, which further enhances the workflow management process of Kanaya et al. by enabling the tracking of more detailed information related to the workflow process.

Claim 22 recites substantially similar subject matter as claim 21 above.

Therefore, claim 22 is rejected on the same basis as claim 21 above.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Bowman-Amuah (U.S. 6,529,948) discusses a multi-object fetch component;
- Hayashi et al. (U.S. 6,671,855) discusses a document workflow management system;
- Tsuiki et al. (U.S. 6,144,955) discusses a workflow management system; and
- Brandt et al. (U.S. 6,714,979) discusses the use of keys to extract data from tables.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Michelle Tarae (formerly, C. Michelle Colon) whose telephone number is 571-272-6727. The examiner can normally be reached Monday – Friday from 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz, can be reached at 571-272-6729.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



C. Michelle Tarae  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 3623

February 17, 2006